



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,643	05/09/2006	Pieter Jan Mark Smidt	NL 031338	1732
24737 7590 10/14/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER AKINYEMI, AJIBOLA A				
ART UNIT 2618		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 10/14/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/578,643

Applicant(s)

SMIDT, PIETER JAN MARK

Examiner

AJIBOLA AKINYEMI

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05/09/2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka (Pub. No.: US 2006/0071804A1) and further in view of Yoshida (Patent No.: US 5963442).

With respect to claim 1:

Yoshioka disclosed a power supply arrangement comprising a first power supply (fig.3, item 18) wherein said first supply produces at least one first output voltage and supplies it to a first device (12) a second power supply (Fig.3, item 19) having a configuration arranged to produce at least one second output voltage, wherein said second supply produces said at least one second output voltage and supplies it to a second device. A control means (Fig.3, item 182) arranged to operate said second power supply, wherein

said second power supply is deactivated when said first device is operative and fed from said first power supply. Yoshioka did not disclose a power supply that is sensitive to electromagnetic interference. Yoshida disclosed a power supply that is sensitive to electromagnetic interference (col.3, lines 45-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a power supply arrangement that can inhibit electromagnetic interference in order to have a good reception.

With respect to claim 2:

Yoshida further disclosed power supply arrangement wherein first device comprise a tuner operated to receive AM or FM band (col.3, lines 9-21)

With respect to claim 3:

Yoshioka disclosed a power supply arrangement wherein the two power supplies are fed from the same power supply (fig.1, item 5 into items 18 and 19).

With respect to claim 6:

Yoshioka disclosed a power supply wherein said power supply is included in audio equipment together with first and second device (fig.3).

With respect to claim 7:

Yoshioka disclosed a power supply arrangement wherein said control means is controlled by the audio equipment (parag.0023).

With respect to claim 8:

Yoshioka disclosed the power supply arrangement wherein control means comprises a microprocessor running an application software which instructs said microprocessor how to operate said second power supply (parag.0085).

4. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka (Pub. No.: US 2006/0071804A1) and further in view of Yoshida (Patent No.: US 5963442) and Kimura (Pub. No.: US 2007/0058400A1).

With respect to claim 4 and 5:

Yoshioka disclosed a power supply arrangement comprising a first power supply (fig.3, item 18) wherein said first supply produces at least one first output voltage and supplies it to a first device (12) a second power supply (Fig.3, item 19) having a configuration arranged to produce at least one second output voltage, wherein said second supply produces said at least one second output voltage and supplies it to a second device. a control means (Fig.3, item 182) arranged to operate said second power supply, wherein said second power supply is deactivated when said first device is operative and fed from said first power supply. Yoshida disclosed a power supply that is sensitive to electromagnetic interference (col.3, lines 45-54). Yoshioka and Yoshida did not disclose half-bridge and flyback converter. Kimura disclosed half-bridge and flyback converter (parag. 0025). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a half-bridge and flyback converter in order for voltage ratios to be multiplied with an additional advantage of isolation.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AJIBOLA AKINYEMI whose telephone number is (571)270-1846. The examiner can normally be reached on monday- friday (8.30-5pm) Est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, YUWEN PAN can be reached on (571) 272-7855. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AA
/Yuwen Pan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618